

**UNPUBLISHED**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**

**FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

RICHARD L. BAST,  
Plaintiff-Appellant,

and

INTER-WORLD DEVELOPMENT  
CORPORATION; INTERNATIONAL  
INVESTIGATIONS, INCORPORATED,  
Plaintiffs,

v.

VICTOR MICHAEL GLASBERG; JEANNE  
GOLDBERG; COHEN, DUNN & SINCLAIR,  
PC; J. FREDERICK SINCLAIR; THOMAS J.

No. 97-1185

CURCIO; ANTONIA LEIGH PETTIT; CARTER  
& KRAMER, PC; CHARLES WARREN  
KRAMER; JACOBVITZ, ENGLISH & SMITH,  
PC; DAVID SMITH; BARBARA OZELLA  
REVES; CLAUDE DAVID CONVISSER;  
WILLIAM G. BILLINGHAM; NANCY  
GERTNER; PATRICIA GRIEST; JODY L.  
NEWMAN; JOHN F. DAVIS; MARY AUDREY  
LARKIN; LOIS AMES; DELMAR D.  
HARTLEY; ANTHONY JOSEPH PETTIT; ANNE  
CONNELL; WILLIAM C. HILLMAN; ROGER  
A. COX,  
Defendants-Appellees,

STEPHEN A. ARMSTRONG,  
Party in Interest-Appellee,

and  
MADDONA LEA SCHAMP PETTIT, removed  
to Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia,  
Defendant.

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria.  
Albert V. Bryan, Jr., Senior District Judge.  
(CA-95-531-A)

Submitted: October 28, 1997

Decided: November 18, 1997

Before HAMILTON, LUTTIG, and WILLIAMS, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed and remanded by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

#### **COUNSEL**

Richard L. Bast, Appellant Pro Se. Victor Michael Glasberg, VICTOR M. GLASBERG & ASSOCIATES, Alexandria, Virginia; Frank Willard Dunham, Jr., COHEN, GETTINGS, DUNHAM & HARRISON, Arlington, Virginia; Barbara Ozella Reves, Alexandria, Virginia; John Otto Easton, JORDAN, COYNE & SAVITS, Fairfax, Virginia; Patricia Griest, Beavercreek, Ohio; Pamela Anne Bresnahan, Steven Robert Becker, VORYS, SATER, SEYMOUR & PEASE, Washington, D.C.; Stephen A. Armstrong, ARMSTRONG & CARON, Fairfax, Virginia; Gottlieb James Frick, II, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

---

## OPINION

### PER CURIAM:

Richard L. Bast appeals from the district court's orders denying his motions to recuse and for reconsideration of his motion to recuse. Our review of the record and the district court's opinions discloses that this appeal is without merit. We find that the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying either Bast's motion for recusal, see United States v. Mitchell, 886 F.2d 667, 671 (4th Cir. 1989), or his motion for reconsideration of the denial of his motion for recusal. See Collision v. International Chem. Workers Union, 34 F.3d 233, 236 (4th Cir. 1994). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's orders.

Appellees have filed a motion to dismiss this appeal and for sanctions. We find that Bast's appeal is frivolous, as it is without factual or legal support. Plus, it is the latest of several of Bast's frivolous appeals, and is merely a continuation of Bast's abuse of the legal process. We deny Appellees' motion to dismiss, but grant Appellees' motion for Fed. R. App. P. 38 sanctions and remand to the district court for a determination of costs and attorneys' fees. See In re Vincent, 105 F.3d 943, 944 (4th Cir. 1997). We deny as moot Appellees' motion for ruling on pending motion to dismiss and for sanctions. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the Court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

### AFFIRMED AND REMANDED